

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/541,676	07/08/2005	Dirk Reissenweber	2923-717	4121		
6449 ROTHWELL	7590 09/08/200 FIGG, ERNST & MAN	EXAM	EXAMINER			
1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ROLLANI	ROLLAND, ALEX A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1792			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			09/08/2009	ELECTRONIC		

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

## **Advisory Action** Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/541,676	REISSENWEBER, DIRK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALEX ROLLAND	1792	

	ALEX ROLLAND	1792					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 26 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
<ol> <li>X he reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITH MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1						
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set of the in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earnet patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	nally set in the final Office	e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	iled within two month	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t</li> </ol>			cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		E below);					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo							
<ul> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reig	cted claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).				
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)   how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving.</li> </ol>		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu							
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	·						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
NECOMEST FOR NECOMBIDENCY INCOMENT.  I. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.							
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13. Other:							
/Michael Cleveland/	/ALEX ROLLAND/						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792	Examiner, Art Unit 1792						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Examiner, Art Unit 1792

Continuation of 3, NOTE: claim amendments introduce additional limitations (i.e. "slack"),

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments are not convincing. As to the combination of Curiel and Zeiter, it is noted that Curiel states that it is known in the art to encapsulate informational articles of this type in PVC (ool. 1, lines 26-27) and the information 6, 8, and 10 desired to isolate from direct access and alteration (o.l. 6, lines 36-41) are located on a single side of article (Fig. 2). Therefore, removal of the polymer on the opposite side of the information would not destroy the object of the invention. As to the buffer arrangement, the plain meaning of "buffer arrangement" is broad enough to read on the ink deposition taught by Curiel and the claim amendments that require the buffer arrangement have not been entered.